UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/811,160	03/26/2004	Eric Joseph Bilskie	9596	1981	
27752 7590 02/27/2007 THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY				INER	
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DIVISION WINTON HILL BUSINESS CENTER - BOX 161 6110 CENTER HILL AVENUE			PETERSON, KENNETH E		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
CINCINNATI, O	H 45224		3724		
QUARTE TO STATISTARY	DEBIOD OF BEGDONGE	MAIL DATE	DELIVER	VMODE	
SHORTENED STATUTORY F	PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MONT	THC	02/27/2007	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

		<u> </u>
Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/811,160	BILSKIE ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Kenneth E. Peterson	3724	
appears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address	
DATE OF THIS COMMUNICA 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a rep od will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTH tute, cause the application to become ABAR	ATION.  by be timely filed  files from the mailing date of this community  files (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
3 January 2007.		
•	·	its is
r Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D.	11, 453 O.G. 213.	
are withdrawn from considera	tion.	
ccepted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance ection is required if the drawing(s)	e. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.1	
ents have been received. ents have been received in Appriority documents have been re eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	olication No eceived in this National Stage	e
Paper No(s)/l 5) Notice of Info	Mail Date mal Patent Application	
	Examiner Kenneth E. Peterson  Appears on the cover sheet with  PLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MO DATE OF THIS COMMUNICA 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a repload will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTH tute, cause the application to become ABAN illing date of this communication, even if time  B. January 2007. his action is non-final. wance except for formal matter or Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D.  Dending in the application. Vare withdrawn from considerate  rejected.  d/or election requirement.  diner. cocepted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance rection is required if the drawing(s) Examiner. Note the attached (c)  gn priority under 35 U.S.C. § 1  ents have been received. ents have been received in Appriority documents have been received are paper No(s)/figure and priority documents have been received and (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  ist of the certified copies not received in the communication of the certified copies not received in the certified copies not received.	Examiner Kenneth E. Peterson  Art Unit 3724  Appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address  PLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DA  DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed  od will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any  B. January 2007.  In a cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).  B. January 2007.  In a cause the application is non-final.  In a cause the application.  In a cause the application is non-final.  In a cause the application.  In a cause the application is non-final.  In a cause the a

Application/Control Number: 10/811,160 Page 2

Art Unit: 3724

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1,3-7,9,11-14,16,18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

McCay et al.'575 shows a core slabber with most of the recited limitation including a cutter (30) mounted on an axial traversing element (23,31), which in turn is mounted on a radial traversing element (11). The feeler 80 constitutes a controller that determines a maximum depth of cut (paragraph spanning columns 3 and 4). Below the roll is a material removal section, which receives the cut material.

McCay lacks an integral transport element, but it is well known in the art to employ an integral transport element, as taught by Watanabe et al.'971, who shows a carriage 6 for transporting the roll in from a feed section. The roll is intrinsically conveyed to a nearby "discharge station". It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified McCay by adding an integral transport element, as taught by Watanabe, in order to facilitate loading of the heavy roll.

Furthermore, the court have long held that making something integral or separable is a simple matter of design choice by the manufacturer.

3. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that his transport element is "integral" with the apparatus.

Given that Applicant's transport element is movable relative to the apparatus, and is no

doubt removable by disassembly of the device, the term "integral" must be given certain breadth. In this case, the appropriate breadth is "not easily removed nor intended to be removed from the apparatus". In the case of Watanabe, there are two embodiments, a truck on rails, and a conveyor, both set forth on line 33 of column 4. The conveyor is certainly not easily removable from the apparatus. The truck, in combination with the rails it rides on, are also not easily removable. Mind you that wherever those rails lead to, they are still part of the apparatus, so even if the truck travels across the factory floor on the rails, it is still part of the same apparatus, since it is confined to the rails that are part of the apparatus. To distinguish over these references, Applicant needs to focus more on the structural differences between his transport element and those of Watanabe.

Applicant further agues that "integral" means "of, relating to, or serving to form a whole; organically joined or linked". McCay, as modified, actually meets all five of these alternative definitions. Note that the term "organically" is not referring to biological mechanisms, but instead is referring to constituting a basic part. Hsu's truck+rail or conveyor (as modified by Watanabe) is an integral part of the apparatus since they are solidly connected via the support surface.

OF - The truck+rail is part of the apparatus. The conveyor is part of the apparatus.

RELATING TO - The truck+rail is *related to* the apparatus. The conveyor is part *related to* the apparatus.

Application/Control Number: 10/811,160

Art Unit: 3724

SERVING TO FORM A WHOLE – The truck+rail and the paper cutter together serve to form a whole apparatus. The conveyor and the paper cutter together serve to form a whole apparatus.

ORGANICALLY JOINED - The truck+rail is *organically joined to* the apparatus.

The conveyor is part *organically joined to* the apparatus.

LINKED - The truck+rail is *linked to* the apparatus. The conveyor is *linked to* the apparatus.

Meeting any one of these definitions would have been sufficient, and meeting all five is quite convincing.

4. This is an RCE. All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed earlier and have already been finally rejected. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action in this case. See MPEP § 706.07(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no, however, event will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 3724

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kenneth E. Peterson whose telephone number is 571-272-4512. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur, 7:30-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Boyer Ashley can be reached on 571-272-4502. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

KENNETH E. PETERSON PRIMARY EXAMINER

kp